

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 20 2004

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Plow	)	Art Unit: 3671
	)	
Serial No.: 09/922,182	)	Examiner: Mammen
	)	
Filed: August 2, 2001	)	STL9-2000-0035-US1
	)	
For: SYSTEM, METHOD, AND COMPUTER	)	October 20, 2004
PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR STORING INTERNET	)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
ADVERTISEMENTS AT A USER COMPUTER	)	San Diego, CA 92101
	)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 6, 2004, the following remarks are submitted. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Kim et al. (USPP 2002/0052925), and Claims 2, 9, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kim et al. Additionally, all pending claims (1-4, 6-11, and 13-19) have been rejected as being unpatentable over Barnett et al. (USPN 6,336,099) in view of Landsman et al. (USPN 6,317,761).

Kim et al. bears a filing after the present filing date, and so it is not prior art. Kim et al. claims priority from an earlier-filed provisional application, but the examiner's attention is directed to the latest version (May, 2004) of MPEP §2136.03(III), which makes clear that a reference may be accorded the date of an earlier-filed provisional application only *if* the provisional application supports the relied-upon subject matter in the reference (emphasis in original). This has not been shown by, e.g., introducing the provisional

11763.AM4